



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,279	01/29/2001	Toshihiro Shima	Q62411	6249

7590 12/31/2003

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

ARSHAD, UMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/770,279

Applicant(s)

SHIMA, TOSHIHIRO

Examiner

Umar Arshad

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Ammendment A, filed 12/3/2003. This action is final.
2. Claims 1 – 12 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 are independent claims. In the Ammendment A, claim 12 was added and claim 1, 6, and 11 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanevsky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,426,761.

As per claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches an information display system comprising:

means for providing, on a screen of a computer, default sized display areas for a plurality of elements each having detailed information (see Kanevsky et al., figure 1(a), figure 5, and column 3, lines 58 - 63);

means for enlarging a corresponding, default sized display area when a user selects an element from said plurality of elements (see Kanevsky et al., column 11, lines 66 – 67 and column 12, lines 1 – 2);

means for displaying detailed information for said selected element in said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Kanevsky et al., column 12, lines 2 - 4); and

means for also displaying, on said screen, those elements that were not selected so that none of said elements are hidden under said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Kanevsky et al., column 5, lines 33 – 38, column 12, lines 16 – 19, and figure 5, item 610; It is inherent that the area that is zoomed in on the display does not block the rest of the screen in the fractal display of information).

As per claims 6 and 11, they are of similar scope to claim 1 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kanevsky et al. further teaches the information display wherein said means for displaying said unselected elements includes means for reducing sizes of said default sized display areas for said unselected elements and for summarizing contents displayed therein (see Kanevsky et al., figure 5, items 617 and 619, column 4, lines 31 – 57 and column 11, lines 59 - 65; the fractal representation of

icons are reduced in size, the graphical display of the icon is thereby summarized when the icon size is reduced).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 6 (see rejection above). Claim 7 is of similar scope to claim 2 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kanevsky et al. further teaches the information display system wherein said means for displaying said unselected elements includes means for adjusting sizes of display areas of said unselected elements to reflect a magnitude of relevancy of said unselected elements to said selected element (see Kanevsky et al., column 4, lines 24 – 30 and column 11, lines 55 – 58; the relevancy of a group of icons determines the spatial clustering of the fractal centralized around an icon).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 6 (see rejection above). Claim 8 is of similar scope to claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kanevsky et al. further teaches the information display system further comprising means for, when one of said plurality of elements is selected, adjusting arrangement on said display screen of said display areas for said

plurality of elements (see Kanevsky et al., column 4, lines 46 – 67, column 5, lines 1 – 17, and column 12, lines 19 – 23; either the user can manually change the arrangement of the fractal clusters or the computer can dynamically change the arrangement of the fractal clusters).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 6 (see rejection above). Claim 9 is of similar scope to claim 4 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kanevsky et al. further teaches the information display system wherein an element that is related to an objective or the needs of the user is included in said plurality of elements (see Kanevsky et al., column 10, lines 27 – 35; it is inherent that if an icon has been accessed before, it is useful to the user and is related to the needs of the user).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 6, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 6 (see rejection above). Claim 10 is of similar scope to claim 5 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Clark et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,995,101 ("Clark").

As per claim 12, Clark teaches a method of displaying information on a screen of a computer comprising:

displaying on said screen a plurality of elements, each element is displayed in a default sized display area (see Clark, figure 1, element 54);

enlarging a corresponding, default sized display area when a user selects an element from said plurality of elements (see Clark, figure 1, element 50, and column 1, lines 44 – 48);

obtaining from memory sub-elements of said selected element (see Clark, column 5, lines 25 – 29);

displaying said sub-elements for said selected element in said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Clark, figure 1, element 50); and

displaying, on said screen, unselected elements so that none of said elements are hidden under said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Clark, figure 1; it is apparent that none of the buttons are hidden under the tool tip display area).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/3/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued that Kanevsky fails to teach or suggest displaying detailed information for said selected element. Kanevsky only teaches enlarging what is already

shown on the display, it does not pull up and display additional detailed information. The examiner disagrees because Kanevsky teaches displaying detailed information for said selected element (see Kanevsky, column 11, line 66 – column 12, line 2; the examiner interprets magnification to show further detail as displaying detailed information). In addition, it is noted that the step where the system “*pull up* and displays *additional* detailed information” is not in the claim language.

Applicant also argues that Kanevsky teaches magnifying small text only and does not teach or suggest magnifying any size of the displayed text or icon based on user selection. The examiner disagrees because Kanevsky teaches magnifying the displayed text or icon based on user selection (see Kanevsky, column 11, line 66 – column 12, line 2). In addition, it is noted that “magnifying any size of the displayed text or icon” is not in the claim language.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within


TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

UA


STEVEN SAX
PRIMARY EXAMINER